



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. XI, Part I.

The first article in this part, pp. 1-7, is by Cobet, entitled "Hecataei Milesii scripta *ψευδεπίγραφα*." After quoting the passages of Galen in which we are told that the demand of the Alexandrian and Pergamene kings for the works of illustrious authors called forth a supply of forged writings, Cobet says he is convinced that the books of Hecataeus, from which the fragments we possess were taken, were of this character. "Ipsius Hecataei scripta ab Herodoto obscurata et obruta olim perierant et quidquid sub Hecataei nomine ferebatur erat *ψευδεπίγραφον* et Hecataei nil praeter nomen habebat." Passages are quoted from Athenaeus, Arrian, and Strabo, to show that doubt of the authorship was felt by these writers. When the demand came, "apparebant Hecataei *περιηγήσεις, γενεαλογίαι, ιστορίαι*, omnia *ψευδεπίγραφα* et magnam partem ex ipso Herodoto desumpta; quod quum vidissent eruditi satis inepte opinati sunt Herodotum quae Hecataeo sublegisset edidisse pro suis." This opinion, it is true, is entertained by C. Müller, the editor of the *fragmenta Histor. Graec.* But "*πολύμυθημοσύνη, τῆς οὐ κενώτερον οὐδέν*, et sanae rationi officit et obtundit iudicium. Diu et multum in hac palaestra exercitatum esse oportet eum qui antiqua ab recentioribus, genuina a spuriis discernere posse velit; et quia plerique multa quam multum malebant legere factum est ut non haberent (ut Galeni verbis utar) *ἐπιστήμην κριτικὴν τῶν γεγραμμένων*." Prof. Sayce, who has recently undertaken to edit the first three books of Herodotus, shows that, in regard to the claims of Herodotus and of Hecataeus to property in statements which purport to be made by both of them, he is in the uncritical state just censured.

Cobet next, pp. 8-20, gives some notes on the pseudo-Platonic *Theages*, *Hipparchus*, *Amatores*, and *Alcibiades secundus*, as edited by Schanz. There is not much of interest here; but two or three specimens may be cited. "Theag, p. 128b: *ὄρᾱς, ὦ πάτερ, ὅτι Σωκράτης οὐ πάνν μοι δοκεῖ τι ἐθέλειν ἐμοὶ συνδιατρίβειν*. Insanientis oratio est: *ὄρᾱς ὅτι μοι δοκεῖ*. Submota erit omnis difficultas si rescriperis: *ὄρᾱς, ὦ πάτερ; ὁ Σωκράτης οὐ πάνν μοι δοκεῖ ἐθέλειν κτέ.* Delendum est *τι*, namque *οὐ πάνν τι* rectissime dicitur, sed *οὐ πάνν μοι δοκεῖ τι ἐθέλειν* ineptum est. 'Ὁρᾱς sic positum est in Attica perfrequens.'" "P. 128d: *Χαρμίδην γὰρ τούτων γιγνώσκετε τὸν καλὸν ΓεΝόμενον τοῦ Γλαύκωνος*. Quid hoc est. *ὁ καλὸς γενόμενος?* An ex formoso turpis [ex turpi formosus?] factus est? Corrigite: *τὸν καλὸν ΔεΓόμενον*." On Alc. ii, p. 145c, where *οἶδαμεν* occurs, he writes: "Sunt hi Dialogi leves opellae, confabulationes non illepidae, sed inanes nullo certo consilio institutae et exitum non habentes. Qui ista scriptitarunt Platonem volebant imitari videri et utuntur quantum possunt lingua Platonica, ut plurimum satis tersa et nitida. Itaque *οἶδαμεν* pro *ἴσμεν* non

poterant dicere neque ἀποκριθῆναι pro ἀποκρίνασθαι neque aliis sordibus ἐκ τῆς συνηθείας uti."

In the next article, pp. 21-46, Naber continues his notes on Aristophanes. He discusses at length the parts assigned to the several birds in the construction of their city, *Av.* 1136 ff., and makes the sequence of the work and the comprehension of it much simpler by substituting in 1143, 1146 ἐμαλάττοντο, ἐμάλαττον for ἐνεβάλλοντο, ἐνέβαλλον. On 1620, μενετοὶ θεοί, he writes: "non concoquo—equidem scripserim: μενέτω θεός," but referring to the passage in *Thuc.* i, 142, τοῦ πολέμου οἱ καιροὶ οὐ μενετοί, he merely says that the word "miro modo usurpatum est." On 1652, where Herakles is asked, after protesting against being called νόθος, πῶς ἂν ποτε | ἐπὶ κληρὸν εἶναι τὴν Ἀθηναίαν δοκεῖς, | οὖσαν θυγατέρ', ὄντων ἀδελφῶν γνησίῳ, Naber remarks that in this play *Βασίλεια* is represented as the heiress of the property of the defunct Zeus, and wishes to read here τὴν Βασιλειάν σοι 'vel simile quid.' In *Lysist.* 14 he wishes to change βουλευσόμεναισιν οὐ περὶ φαῦλον πράγματος into πράγματος οὐ φαῦλον πέρι. On the difficult line 114, κὰν εἴ με χρεῖη τοῦ κυκλον | τουτὶ καταθεῖσαν ἐκπιεῖν αἰθημερόν, he rejects the interpretation of Blaydes, saying that "abjicerem Blaydesii commentarios nisi hoc incredibile παρόραμα aliis locis redemisset et abunde compensavisset," and then gives his own conjecture περιπατεῖν for ἐκπιεῖν, in which "vera scriptura per se satis agnoscitur." On *Thesm.* 855-7, containing a parody of *Eur. Hel.* 1-3, he suggests λευρούς for λευκῆς in Euripides, and ποτίζει for νοτίζει here. But as to the point of the whole, "latet aliquid quod perpetuo ignorabimus; praestat nunc quoque id quod sexcenties praestat et fatebimur ignorantiam—de ceteris ampliandum censeo, donec Bentleius revixerit." On *Ran.* 609, where, when Xanthias, with οὐκ ἐς κόρακας; μὴ πρόσσιτον, warns off the two slaves Aeacus bids to lay hands upon him, Aeacus exclaims εἶεν, καὶ μάχει; and calls three more with the words χωρεῖτε δέυρο καὶ μάχεσθε τουτῶ, Naber objects that "non hanc μάχην appellamus, quum quinque homines unum eundemque inermem adoriuntur. Prodeunt tres robusti homines, qui cum Xanthia non depugnent, sed eum sine mora comprehendant et manus post tergum revinciant. Itaque legendum, λάβεσθε τουτονί." But the next words of Dionysus imply that Xanthias does use his fists against his assailants: εἴτ' οὐχὶ δεινὰ ταῦτα, τύπτειν τουτονὶ | κλέπτοντα πρὸς τὰ λλότριά; if the necessity of the proposed alteration is not here apparent, the suggestion for the emendation of 788 is very happy. Aeacus says that Sophocles, when he entered Hades, did not insist on assuming the tragic throne ἀλλ' ἔκνεσε μὲν Αἰσχύλον . . . κἀνέβαλε τὴν δεξιάν, κἀκέινος ὑπεχώρησεν αὐτῷ τοῦ θρόνου. Who is ἐκεῖνος? Kock says Sophocles, and that the emphatic pronoun is used of him, because his good manners are contrasted with the impudent self-assertion of Euripides. Green thinks it must be Aeschylus, notwithstanding the objection presented by the use of the aorist. Naber proposes to read Αἰσχύλος, which removes all the difficulty; and argues that it was proper that the kiss should be offered to and not by the new-comer. "Advenam osculamur, ut intelligat se amari et iucundum hospitem adesse; sed si advena anteverterit et osculum occupaverit, praesentiam suam obtrudere videbitur et odium pariet." He shows, by reference to Martial, Fronto, and Friedländer, that such were Roman good manners; and by quoting Aesch. *Agam.* 1560, where it is said that Iphigenia will kiss

her father on his arrival, he indicates that "ἐν Ἀίδου iidem mores obtinent quos sub sole homines observitant."

The next article, pp. 47-58, is on the 6th book of Plato's *Leges*, by the late Prof. Badham, of Sidney. These criticisms will be found of the greatest use by Schanz, when he reaches this treatise in his new edition, though they are not very available for this notice. A few lines may, however, be quoted. 'On p. 774c the conjecture γήμασθαι τὰς πένητας for γηράσκειν τοὺς πένητας brings light where darkness reigned before; and then Badham writes: "ex hoc immani errore plurima conicere licet; primum librum illum, unde nostri derivati sunt, cursivis, ut vocant, litteris exaratum fuisse; nam ni ita esset, μ et ρ confundi non potuissent; deinde compendiis abundasse, quae qui ita descripsit, ut in plenas litteras converteret, quid singula significarent prorsus ignorare non potuit. Itaque ut nonnihil huius hominis socordiae tribuamus, ipsarum siglarum obscuris et prope evanidis ductibus magna pars errorum imputanda erit. Sed vide modo quae ad hos errores defendendos explicandosque Astius et Stallbaumius in omnibus fere paginis excogitant! ita ut mador, quem omnium rerum parentem esse accepimus, novam etiam Graecitatem peperisse videatur. Ipsas autem tineas blattasque et quidquid est lucifugarum bestiarum suam habere grammaticam diceres, nostra illa vulgari longe subtiliorem. Quam quidem Jowetto ceterisque lucifugis relinquendam censeo; quod utinam soli has sordes depascerentur, neque academiae nostrae talibus convivoribus miseram inventutem nutriendam committi."

Van Herwerden follows with *Paralipomena Thucydidea*, pp. 59-68, in which, in addition to making a few new suggestions, he calls attention to a good many oversights in his recently completed edition. One of the new points is on iv, 128. 2, οἱ γὰρ βάρβαροι καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν, τῆς τροπῆς αὐτοῖς ἐνταῦθα γενομένης σφῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ μετεώρου, "alterum pronomen admodum mihi suspectum est. Nisi fallor, Thucydides more suo proleptice scripserat τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ μετεώρου (i. e. τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ λόφου, ut paulo ante dixit). Ad τῶν cum librarii errore adhaesisset sigma praegressi participii γενομένης itaque legeretur ΣΤΩΝ, nescio quis rem praeclare gerere sibi visus est corrigens scilicet ΣΦΩΝ, quod hodie ab interpretibus ingeniosius quam prudentius explicari assolet." At the end of the article, Herwerden refers to the corrections of the text proposed by Vollgraff, and noticed in this Journal, Vol. IV, p. 124. The two that were there commended he accepts; and, in regard to the proposed omission of καλῶς in οἷς κόσμος καλῶς τοῦτο δρᾶν (I 5, 2), he says that he abstained from dropping the word in his edition only because he could not then account for its insertion. He thinks now that it perhaps arose from a marginal καλόν in explanation of κόσμος: "quod cum in textum migrasset, a correctore, ut grammatica salva esset, in καλῶς mutatum est."

We have next, pp. 69-106, Cobet's critical notes on Stein's edition of Herodotus, in continuation of his general remarks on the character of the MSS, reported in this Journal, IV 122. His first comment is on the orthography of the patril name of Herodotus, in which he maintains that only a single σ should be used as in Ἀργινοῦσαι, etc., and that the MSS are of absolutely no weight in such matters, "quis credat quidquam homuncionibus, qui τί μοι μέλλει; pro μέλει scribere solent?" In commenting on Stein's ἐξείει, i, 6, =

ἐξίησι, Cobet says we should write ἐξιῇ. "Verborum in -μi exeuntium apud Herodotum hae certae formae sunt: τίθημι, τιθεῖς τιθεῖ et in imperfecto ἐτίθηα, ἐτίθεις, ἐτίθει, δίδωμι, δίδοις, διδοῖ et nonnumquam δίδωσι, et in imperfecto ἐδίδουν, ἐδίδους, ἐδίδον, etc." On i, 11, ὅθεν περ καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ ἐπεδέξατο γυνήν, he writes: "sententia clamat emendandum esse ostendit tibi, ἐπέδεξα TOI ; ii, 42 : τὰ Δία ἐνδύντα τὸ νάκος οὕτω οἱ ἑωντὸν ἐπιδέξαι. Ἐπιδεικνύναι significat monstrare alicui aliquid quod lubenter et incunde spectet, ut Candaules formosam uxorem Gygi ; cf. IV 168 : τῷ βασιλεῖ—τὰς παρθένους—ἐπιδεικνύουσι." In i, 51, after the word of the inscription ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ, he assumes a lacuna, and writes the whole thus: διὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ταύτην οἱ Δελφοὶ Λακεδαιμονίων φασὶ εἶναι ἀνάθημα οὐκ ὁρθῶς λέγοντες. On i, 64, where he substitutes πιθομένων for πειθομένων, he writes: "perpetuo in Herodoti libris miscentur inter se πειθόμενος, πιθόμενος, πωθόμενος et barbarum ποιθόμενος. Quid sit ubique verum τὰ συμφραζόμενα declarant. Πθέσθαι apud Graeculos non erat in usu ; itaque πείθεσθαι scribebant etiam apud poetas iugulato metro, ut in Nubibus v. 851 : κἀγὼ τοί ποτε | οἶδ' ἐξέτει σοι τραυλίσαντι πῖθόμενος. Ravennas habet πειθόμενος." On i, 86 we are told that Stein is constantly wrong in printing εἰρεσθαι and ἐπείρεσθαι: "nam aoristi secundi hae formae sunt. Apud Herodotum praesens et imperfectum est constanter εἰρωτᾶν et ἐπερωτᾶν—sed haec verbi forma non ultra hos fines progreditur. Aoristus est semper et ubique εἰρόμην—et in infinitivo εἰρέσθαι—ut λαβέσθαι—alia sexcenta. Futurum est summa constantia εἰρήσομαι et ἐπειρήσομαι. Itaque εἰρόμην idem est quod ἡρώτησα, et εἰρήσομαι idem quod ἐρωτήσω. Graviter igitur falluntur qui εἰρόμην imperfectum esse opinantur." Many examples are quoted to show that the fact is as he states it, e. g. iii, 32 : λαβοῦσαν θρίδακα τὴν γυναικα περιτίλαι καὶ ἐπανείρεσθαι τὸν ἀνδρα "imo vero ἐπανείρεσθαι id est ἐπαπερωτῆσαι." He allows, however, that Homer uses εἰρομαι, &c. for ἐρωτᾶν, as in οὐτ' εἰρομαι οὔτε μεταλλῶ, "sed nulla huius formae apud Herodotum vestigia sunt." In a similar way, on i, 125 : Κῆρος μὲν ταῦτα προηγόρευσεν, Cobet maintains, as he has done before in V. L. p. 36, that in good writers this verb, simple and compound, is not used beyond the present and imperfect tenses ; and that, therefore, when we find the aorist we must restore the imperfect ; since Herodotus used the imperfect "ἱαστί pro aoristo et in aliis sexcentis ut ἔλεγε pro εἶπε.—Est in omnibus certa dicendi consuetudo semper et ubique sine ulla exceptione τὰ αὐτὰ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν λέγειν. Diversissima miscet et verbis ludit Lachmannus a Steinio laudatus pag. xlviii ubi dicit: 'summam constantiam in dicendo scribendoque quaerere animi illiberalis esse.' In plerisque enim certus et constans dicendi usus est, in aliis consuetudo est varia ; itaque qui in universum de omnibus pronuntiat οὐδὲν λέγει. Herodotus in primis τὰ αὐτὰ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν λέγει sibi in dicendo mirifice constat, quo certior et evidentior emendatio est ubi scribarum vitio sibi ipse dissimilis reperitur." It is worth while to note that, in regard to this limitation of the classical forms of ἀγορεύειν, Veitch thinks that Cobet "has been misled by a too exclusive attention to a particular class of writers." In i, 148 we have the remarkable phenomenon of Cobet defending the genuineness of a passage which Stein had bracketed as one of the observations which "pariebat antiquitus grammatica ars adhuc in cunis vagiens et ψελλίζουσα." The remark in question is that the names of Hellenic festivals all end ἐς τῶντὸ γράμμα. Cobet points out that it is of just the same character as one made before, in c. 139, on the

uniform termination of Persian names, "quae quum sint sine controversia genuina, apparet non esse tangendam alteram de genere hoc observationem paenè gemellam. Quod autem nostro loco repetit: κατάπερ τῶν Περσέων τὰ οὐνόματα indicio est Herodoto ipsi hanc animadversionem satis placuisse. Praeterea ipsa oratio non grammaticum nescio quem arguit, sed veterem aliquem scriptorem Ionicum loqui. Quis enim grammaticus, ut hoc utar, dixisset: πεπόνθασι τοῦτο eo sensu?"

The last article in this part, pp. 107-12, is by van Herwerden on the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius. The text is, he admits, in a fairly satisfactory condition; but there are still a good many passages, "qui hucusque frustra medicam manum expectarint." The first of these which he touches upon is i, 59, where we are told of Kaineus that ζῶν περ ἐτι κλείουσιν αἰδοὶ | Κενταύροιςιν ὀλέσθαι, "quasi vero mortuus perire potuisset." What is probably the true reading is preserved by the Schol. on Il. A 264: Καυνέα γὰρ δὴ πρόσθεν κτέ., since the metre does not allow οἱ πρόσθεν ἐπικλείουσιν of l. 18 to be used here. In i, 262, in the description of the anxious grief with which the departure of Jason and his companions was attended, we have the words μήτηρ δ' ἄμφ' αὐτὸν βεβολημένη, which the Latin version renders *mater vero ipsum amplexa est*. But there are several objections to the use of this perf. partic. in the sense of περιπλεκομένη, and again the schol. suggests an entirely different thought in his comment, λύπη βλαβεῖσα ἢ δυσθυμοῦσα. But, since no instance can be adduced of the use of the verb alone in this sense, without the addition of a dative, "eius affectionis qua quis percussus sit," H. suggests that we should write ἀμφασὲν βεβολημένην, *stupore percussa*. In i, 717 we read Ὑψιπέλῃν δ' εἰσαντο καταφθιμένῳ Θόαντος . . . ἀνασέμεν. It is shown that εἰσαντο cannot be used for ἴσαν (ἦδσαν) and that Thoas was not really dead. This renders the correction οἶσαντο exceedingly probable. In ii, 320 we have the form ἐρέρενται for ἐρηρέδαται. This is no *librarii* σφάλαμα, for in iii, 1328 we find ἡρήρεντο, and many other 'monstra' of the same sort occur, as ἔλειπτο for ἐλέλειπτο, ἡείδεν for ἦδσαν, σφώτερος for σφέτερος, δακρύνειν for δακρύνειν, νῆν for νῆα; and the proper meaning of words as much disregarded, as in the use of ἀτέμβεσθαι for μέμψεσθαι, πέφαται for ἔλεγκται, ἀμαλδύνειν for κρύπτειν, ὑποβλήδην for ἐν τῷ μέρει, νέποδες for ἀπόγονοι, μάλιστα ἢ for μᾶλλον ἢ, and many others.

The parts of pages otherwise unoccupied are filled by Cobet with notes on Suidas and Diodorus Siculus.

C. D. MORRIS.

HERMES. 1883.

Part I.

R. Hirzel, Ein unbeachtetes Comoedienfragment. Hirzel, after Numenius and after Diogenes, relates an anecdote of the philosopher Lacydes, and, comparing the two versions, argues that this amusing story is derived from some play of (Middle) Attic comedy. Lacydes is confronted by the fact that his slaves purloin from his pantry in a manner inexplicable to himself, and he consequently adopts the Academic *skepsis* as his platform. Later, however, as he finds it impossible properly to rebuke and restrain his thieving domestics on this basis of morals, he is compelled to return to Stoicism, because he finds the Academic tenets inapplicable to the problems of practical and actual

life. Hirzel attempts, with some ingenuity, to reconstruct the dramatic development of the story.

H. Kühlewein discusses the text and the MSS of Hippocrates' treatise on water, air and localities.

G. Knaack (Analecta) presents a number of critical notes on passages in Ovid, Petronius, Apollonius, etc.

A. Gemoll, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Ilias und Odyssee*. This paper is the result of much toil. The author discusses 136 passages of the *Odyssey* which either closely resemble, or are identical with, passages of the *Iliad*. The general result of the investigation is presented on p. 35. "Amongst the 136 passages there are but three, and those later insertions, *Il. φ*, in which the *Odyssey* proves to be the original." The theory of a common storehouse of current epic diction he endeavors to remove, as far as possible, from his discussion, insisting that in the *Iliad* the phrases seem to have been composed especially for the particular situation, whereas in the *Odyssey* this fitness was not so palpable. It is interesting to note that, in conformity with his general theory, Gemoll decidedly rejects the thesis of Hinrichs ("On the *Chryseis* episode," noticed in a former number of this *Journal*), according to which that portion of A is a *contaminatio* or *cento*, gathered from other passages of the *Iliad*, from the *Odyssey*, and from the hymn on the Delphian Apollo. As regards the *Odyssey*, Gemoll says (p. 39), "I am unable to find that even a single passage of it has been proved to be the original; nay, I shall prove the opposite in all those passages that are not epic formulas." While we must remember that in such discussions the author will be inclined to adjust critical details to his main thesis, still Gemoll seems to have made many substantial points which will prove suggestive to the critical student of Homer.

H. Roehl, *In Franciscum Lenormant Inscriptionum Falsarium Responsio Altera*. Roehl points out with ample detail that Lenormant's rejoinder to his own sharp strictures (*Hermes*, 1882, p. 448 sqq.) is defective or evasive, and says, in closing (p. 102), "Hoc loco nunc est quaestio de eis Lenormanti monumentis, quae publice infamata sunt. Nec non et ceterorum multa coticulam sibi postulant (cf. *Hermes*, XVII 462) dico inscriptiones Aegaei, alias, imprimis quas annis 1866, 1867, 1868 edidit, nam his maxime annis adulterandi cupido velut teter morbus eum videtur obsedis; sed haec in aliud tempus differenda."

O. Richter, *Clivus Capitolinus*. Richter charges Jordan with various errors in his attempt to reconcile modern excavations with ancient authorities, and himself discusses all the antiquarian detail of the subject (the *Capitolium* proper, the *arx* on the northern end of the hill, the road leading to it) with exhaustive accuracy.

M. Schanz, *Zu Hermeias*. The well-known editor of Plato's text prints a note which proves that Ast's edition of Hermeias' scholia on Phaedrus is faulty; the definition of love (p. 76, Ast) ascribed to Euclides (Socraticus) must, according to the better reading, be ascribed to Heraclides Ponticus (Peripateticus); the term *κατὰ συμβεβηκός*, in a definition of a pre-Aristotelian philosopher, would alone constitute a grave anachronism.

Part II.

Th. Mommsen, *Die italischen Bürgercolonien von Sulla bis Vespasian*. This paper is partly statistical and partly critical. The towns of Italy, ever since the peninsula had fallen entirely under Roman sway, were either *municipia* or *coloniae*, the latter having the full franchise of Roman citizenship and being generally governed by an executive of *duumviri*, whereas in the *municipia*, *quattuor viri* are commonly found. As a rule, the act of *deductio* involved the legal expulsion of the owners from their land. The most familiar instance of such expropriation occurs in Vergil's *Eclogues* (Cremona). Mommsen discusses and registers colonies of Sulla, of Caesar, of the second triumvirate, of Augustus, *Coloniae Juliae* in Italy. The sources of information aside from historians are mostly inscriptions. The list in Pliny is specially discussed, and M. finds it to be very defective; the sources of this latter enumeration are discussed on p. 198 sqq.¹ The high statesmanship of C. Julius Caesar is attested by the fact that he absolutely abstained from establishing military colonies in Italy. In this matter, too, he refrained from satisfying one class by stripping another. Amongst the more notable names in the general list subjoined by Mommsen we meet Ancona, Ariminum, Beneventum, Bononia, Cremona, Crotona, Cumae, Luceria, Nola, Praeneste, Tarentum, Tergeste, Venusia.

Wilamowitz, *Die beiden Electren*. This paper exhibits the same traits that W.'s earlier productions possess, a certain pungency in dissent, coupled with enthusiastic and sanguine development of the thesis maintained. To illustrate the former: at one point of his discourse, Aristarchus is an obstacle (p. 261) which is brushed aside with the phrase: "Dagegen helfen Aristarch's schale Exegetenkünste nichts." At another point W. disagrees with Pausanias, the consequences being somewhat serious for the latter: "Dieser Schriftsteller hat einmal das Vorrecht als Theopneust behandelt zu werden, obgleich er ausser allen sonstigen Fehlern auch den einer erstaunlichen Zerstreutheit hat" (p. 252).

W. aims at proving not only that the *Electra* of Sophocles is a later production than the Euripidean play of the same name, but that its preparation was directly prompted by the latter; that in it Sophocles strove to reassert the ancient, strictly epic view of the plot, whereas Euripides, before him, had recast the legend with bold originality, making *Electra* the chief heroine, and her will and design the mainspring of the action. The detailed analysis of each drama is executed with great warmth and with unmistakable appreciation of the purely literary points in both productions. Psychology, the ancient legend, the canons of ancient morality, all these are handled with much skill. Euripides, thus W. argues,—his remarks, although not novel, are replete with force and point,—Euripides not only advanced beyond the legend, but challenged that almost sacred tradition, not only as to its truth, but also as to its morality.

¹ It is notorious that the Roman "colonies" were originally contrivances to secure and promote sway and conquest by the establishment, amongst peoples subjected or to be subjected, of Roman citizens. These colonies, moreover, differed vastly from the Greek colonies, inasmuch as their substantial connections and coherence with the *city* was never impaired, they being *excubiae*, as it were, of the central governing commonwealth.—E. G. S.

For its parallel criticism of Euripides and Sophocles, its appreciation of the peculiar genesis of their composition, the paper is valuable, its glow being tempered with acute historical criticism. But whether other eyes will readily recognize the relations between the two plays which the interpretation of W. has constructed, time will show. In the mind of the author of such an ingenious combination there is a natural tendency to advance that which is merely plausible into the category of demonstrated truth. In the second part of his paper, W., dating as he does the *Electra* of Sophocles after 413 B. C., brings forward a number of points which, according to him, mark a very late stage of Sophoclean composition, the slight share that the chorus takes in the action, the slender and mechanical lines of connexion between chorus and plot, the peculiar use of plaintive anapaests, and the resemblance of the ionic strophe (v. 824) to the ionic of O. C. 510.

An excursus is appended, in which W. deals with the legend of Iphigenia. His principal aim is to organize or reorganize the Attic legend of Theseus and Helena, and the connection of the Brauronian Artemis with the birth and fates of Helen's daughter by Theseus, Iphigenia. Wilamowitz concludes this chapter with the words, "I have dared to utter what the ancient Diacrians seem to me to have composed. And if I have been wide of the mark in the matter, I know that they will forgive me. For it is poetry of no mean value which I credit them with."

A. Piccolomini, of Pisa, writes: *Quaestionum de Archilochi capita tria*. As regards the hanging of Lycambes and Neobule, P. suggests taking ἀπάγασθαι in a metaphorical sense; further, that the story, told by Plutarch, of Archilochus' expulsion from Sparta must be understood to his poetry solely; and, finally, that τέττιξ, ap. Suidam (Archilochus), really refers to the dead poet himself.

Polak, of Rotterdam, *Ad Choricii declamationes notulae*. One of the declamations of this Byzantine rhetorician (age of Justinian) has recently been edited by Foerster in the *Hermes*. P. communicates a number of emendations of the text, although in principle he does not think it worth while to devote so much critical study to so late a writer.

O. Seeck, of Greifswald, discourses on, and establishes more fully, the series of Prefects of Rome occurring in Ammianus Marcellinus. These fill the years 353-74 A. D.

P. Stengel on ΔΥΚΑΒΑΣ, "course of light" (Hom. ξ 161, τ 306 sq.) S. argues that Δυκάβας means not the annual course of the sun, because in Homer there is no fixed point whatever for beginning or ending that measure of time. Consequently, S. insists, we are compelled to resort to the lunar month as being designated by the term, *i. e.* the equivalent of four weeks beginning at any given time.

E. G. SIHLER.

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF ATHENA PARTHENOS.

G. KIESERITZKY, *Athena Parthenos der Ermitage*. Mittheilungen des deutschen Archaeologischen Institutes in Athen. Achter Jahrgang, Viertes Heft, p. 291 u. Taf. XV.

By good fortune, the marble statuette found near the Βαββάκειον in 1880, which many thought would settle forever all controversy about the appearance of the chryselephantine original of Pheidias, has already proved to be a buoy marking, not the roadstead where the ship of investigation may anchor, but the channel by which her progress must be made. It was to be feared that the assured authenticity of the evidence would cause it to be regarded as absolute; in the resulting neglect of other sources of knowledge, the theory of the laws of Greek art would, doubtless, be enriched with many a new and narrow dogma. The number of *replicas* of the Parthenos recognized or substantiated by the Βαββάκειον copy is almost bewildering. Differing from one another in size and material, they have in common the point of very considerable reduction from the scale of their colossal original. It is readily understood how this circumstance would affect the copies in the suppression of detail. Less understood, or more hardly admitted, has been the impossibility of rendering in chiselled marble, stamped silver or graven gem, the peculiarities of a monument composed of carved ivory and beaten gold. It is from southern Russia, the ancient sepulchres of which are well-known treasuries of rare Greek gold-work, that the last important addition to the materials for the ideal reconstruction of the Parthenos, possessing the merit of identity of material, and emphasising this necessary difference in the artistic treatment of different substances, originally came; it is an archaeologist who, conversant with the unique collection of the Imperial Ermitage of St. Petersburg, has learned something of the technique of the Greek goldsmith, who presents them as copies of the head of the chryselephantine Athena of Pheidias.

Found in a tumulus near Kertch (Pantikapaion) in 1830, lying on the breast of a woman buried beside her husband, the two medallions of beaten gold given in phototypy on Plate XV were evidently pendants; similar pieces in other tombs had their place over the temples, as hanging ornaments of a diadem. Circular in form (diam. 0.072 m.), they were hung by an eye at the top; a flat rim on the circumference, of which the decoration is a delicate ivy vine enlivened by green and blue enamel leaves between the stems and tendrils of soldered wire, is bordered by smooth wires 0.006 m. apart. To the lower half of the circle rosettes of similar enamelled ivy leaves are soldered, to which was suspended an elaborate but damaged chain ornament; this included, each jewel has a length of 0.187 m. A circle of filigree twist contiguous to the inner smooth wire of the rim corresponds to an identical ornament on the outer edge and encircles the raised central part of the medallion. The form is thus precisely that of an Argive shield.

The process of manufacture consisted in the cutting of a hard metal die, into the hollows of which the thick gold plate, overlaid with one of lead—for the sharp angles and projections of the front appear blunt behind—was beaten by hammer and puncheon, to be touched up, before the soldered wire and enamel ornament was applied to the flat rim, with graver's tools. This

chased work is conspicuous in the hair of the curls and crests, in the feathers of the animals, and in the dented lines that decorate the helmet.

It is the helmeted head of Athena, in semi-profile, that is represented on both plates; the symmetry is complete, so much so that not only do the heads face different ways, but the one-sided attributes occupy opposite sides—were it not for a slight inferiority of execution, and the flattening sustained from the falling of a rafter in the tumulus of Koul-Oba, No. 2 would seem the mirrored image of No. 1. The two, No. 1 being taken for the example of the pair, can be spoken of as one.

All the detail of the *Βαρβάκειον* statuette is repeated in the gold head: the visored Attic helmet, with its raised cheek-pieces and three crests supported by the Sphinx and Pegasoi, and the two curls on each side of the characteristic round visage vindicated by Schreiber as a development of the Attic Athena type. The Sphinx lies in the same posture, with the same raised wings concealing the support of the crest; the horses' heads, much resembling those of the Parthenon pediment, are turned outward, and their wings have the same archaic upward curve of the tips that fits so well into the arched crest-pieces above; the relief does not, however, represent them raised on their fore-feet, a posture even the sculptured copy would hardly have adopted unless in deference to the original, where otherwise, from the elevated position, they would have been invisible behind the false visor and its decoration. This part of the helmet appears on the medallion without the customary nose-peak, and Kieseritzky regards this peculiarity as derived from the original. In the elaborate ornamentation, in dotted lines, of all the non-decorative parts of the helmet, breaking the surface of the yellow gold; in the thread-like appearance of the hair and spiral form of the long curls, so different from the conventional zigzag of the marble; in the broken brushiness of the right crest, the medallion has more faithfully than any other copies reproduced the technique of an original made of the same ductile metal.

But attributes and ornaments entirely suppressed by the statuary, just as he suppressed the reliefs of the goddess' shield and sandals, are found here. Pausanias (αὐτὸ δὲ ἐκ τε ἐλέφαντος τὸ ἀγάλμα καὶ χρυσοῦ πεποιήται, μέσῳ μὲν οὖν ἐπίκειται οἱ τῷ κράνει Σφίγγος εἰκόν . . . καθ' ἑκάτερον δὲ τοῦ κράνους γρύπες εἶναι ἐπειρασμένοι, I 24, 5) has been taken to task as having mistaken the Pegasoi which flank the Sphinx for griffins. Literally translated, his notice is seen to indicate another decoration of the helmet, the two griffins *rampant* worked in low-relief (ἐπειρασμένοι) on the cheek-pieces, by which low-reliefs on the body of the helmet (καθ' ἑκάτερον τῆς Σφίγγος) would have been hidden from view.

In a row above the narrow false visor appear the heads of ten animals, alternately griffins and hinds. Lange's refusal to accept the negative testimony of the statuette against the positive evidence of the series of Athenian tetradrachms, the gem of Aspasios, and the statues known as the *Minerva Albani* and the *Minerve au collier*, is thus brilliantly justified. But while these replicas indicated horses, Pegasoi or even owls as the decoration of the visor, we now have, in the studied juxtaposition of a virgin and a warrior beast, a reference to the mythological character of the goddess. Stephani has shown these animals associated with Athena elsewhere. Similar animal heads, made of two hollow symmetrical halves joined by soldering, have been discovered in

Russia; but Kieseritzky overestimates the evidential weight of his medallions and becomes over-subtle when he rejects the distinct testimony of the coins and the drawing of the Codex Pighianus, which show the foreparts of prancing animals, and condemns this form as inartistic.

It has always been a matter of surprise that no copy or literary notice associated the familiar owl of Pallas with her most familiar idol; the medallion shows the bird perching on the left upturned cheek-piece (the right one in No. 2), solemnly disregarding of the serpent that snaps at her tail. A necklace of beads, rosettes and drops, as on the gem of Aspasios and a bronze coin published by Mionnet, encircles Athena's neck—the Minerve au collier wears a simple string of beads;—her ear-rings, composed of a disk and conical drop ending in a little ball, are altogether peculiar; for they present a form not yet observed among representations or actual specimens of ancient jewelry. Perhaps the most striking and unexpected light is shed on the position of Athena's spear, which neither of the already employed hands could hold. The statuette omits it. A piece of it is seen here over Athena's left shoulder, where it is held fast in the coil of an aegis snake. It is represented in like manner in the corresponding place on medallion No. 2.

From the laborious effort to reproduce every feature of the original, in which endeavor correctness of projection is frequently set at naught; from the introduction of this segment of spear-shaft, unintelligible to persons unacquainted with the work of Pheidias; from the shade of austerity that tempers the excellence of the workmanship, and finally from the artistic quality of the other objects found in the tumulus of Koul-Oba, which belong mainly to the Greek importation of the fifth and early fourth centuries, Kieseritzky concludes that the medallions were the design and work of an Athenian goldsmith of the school trained, during the construction of the great chryselephantine statue, under the master himself. The oldest, most faithful, and truest copy of the Athena Parthenos would then be invested with an additional charm of association. But though this should not be so, it is still a comfort to recognize, in gazing on the somewhat sad loveliness of this face, that the copyist is answerable for the disappointment so generally inspired by the *ἐπίτρε* countenance of the *Ἀθηνᾶ τοῦ Βασιλείου*.

ALFRED EMERSON.